

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are currently active.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3 and 10 as being anticipated by Fry-Welch. Fry-Welch fails to teach or suggest determining the strength of the hand based on a twisting motion.

Fry-Welch teaches a system for testing hand, wrist and forearm strength. Fry-Welch specifically teaches a dynamometer system is provided with 4 cord-like elements designated as cables 21, 22, 23 and 24. Each of cables 21-24 is associated with a respective one of support members 11-14. In addition, each such cable is terminated at a first end and which is disposed within the open frame structure of the dynamometer system with a respective one of cable terminations 26, 27, 28, and 29. Each of cables 21-24 is installed within a cable sheath. The four cables of the present embodiment and there respectively associated cable sheaths are brought to a clamping block 36 which holds cable sheaths 31-34, but otherwise does not restrict the cables therein to move axially. The 4 cables 21-24 are each engaged with the coupler 37 which is coupled to a transducer 40. Such coupling is achieved by a shaft 39 which is held in place by a shaft support 38. The distal end of transducer 40 is supported by a transducer support block 41. The cables remain within their respective cable

sheaths. Thus, a force is transmitted through the cables, but there is not necessarily present any displacement of the cables within the cable sheath or with respect to clamping block 36 upon the application of the forces described. Transducer 40 produces an electrical signal which corresponds to the tensile force of any of cables 21-24, applied at coupler 37. Coupler 37 is unidirectional in this operation so that it will conduct a tensile force from any of the cables along coupler shaft 39 to the transducer, but will not be responsive to any compressive forces in the cables.

Fry-Welch specifically teaches to determine the strength of the hand, wrist and forearm but does so by not allowing the cables which are squeezed to move. Claim 1 has the limitation of "means for determining the strength of the hand based on a twisting action," emphasis added. Fry-Welch does not teach this limitation. In fact, Fry-Welch teaches away from this limitation by not allowing movement during the testing, let alone a specific movement, twisting. Column 4, lines 60-63, which the Examiner cites as support for this limitation, is completely silent regarding this limitation.

For this reason, Claim 1 of applicants is not anticipated from Fry-Welch. Claims 2 and 3 are dependent to parent Claim 1 and are patentable for the reasons Claim 1 is patentable.

Claim 10 is patentable for the reason Claim 1 is patentable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejections and objections to this application be reconsidered and withdrawn, and Claims 1-13, now in this application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

MARK E. BARATZ, ET AL.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being deposited with the U.S. Postal
Service as first class mail in an envelope
addressed to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-
1450 on 7/21/05

Ansel Schwartz
Ansel M. Schwartz
Registration No. 30,587

By Ansel Schwartz
Ansel M. Schwartz, Esquire
Reg. No. 30,587
One Sterling Plaza
201 N. Craig Street
Suite 304
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
(412) 621-9222

Attorney for Applicants